

October 31, 1967

Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000600240006-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - APPENDIX

A 5339

chief executive of the University, has occupied leadership posts in the nation's educational circles. He was president of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges three years ago and later served as chairman of that group's executive committee. Among other important positions he has held at different times are presidency of the Association of Urban Universities, chairman of the American Council on Education, and trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

His election to head the AAU, during the University of Illinois' Centennial year, is an honor both for President Henry and the state university.

Noting this, Governor Otto Kerner of Illinois, in a special statement of commendation, said "it seems most fitting that this choice should be made at a time when the university celebrates its centennial year and the State of Illinois prepares to enter its sesquicentennial year, and when educational attainments have reached new highs in the State of Illinois in general and at the University of Illinois in particular.

"This honor falls upon a distinguished educator at a distinguished university and reflects well-deserved credit upon both."

The only other UI president to serve as president of the AAU was the late Dr. David Kinley, who held the post in 1914 prior to the time he was chief executive of the University.

We join Gov. Kerner, the community and students and faculty of the three UI campuses, in congratulating President Henry on the new office, confident that his leadership of the AAU will mark another achievement reflecting great credit upon the University of Illinois.

U.S. Public Not Properly Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Julius Epstein, of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, has for some time been researching the question of the U.S. space secrecy policy, which he concludes does great harm to the Nation's best interest.

Mr. Epstein's recent article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times represents one of the first studies on this subject to reach the American public. Believing it will be of interest to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am submitting the full text of Mr. Epstein's article for inclusion herewith:

SOVIET SPACE LOSSES: U.S. PUBLIC NOT PROPERLY INFORMED
(By Julius Epstein)

News on failures of Soviet manned space flights is, at least in part, "managed" by Washington. No American without access to the relevant classified information can know for sure whether the Soviets suffered fatalities in space. But the evidence is clear that Washington would not tell even if it knew all about Soviet space accidents.

Rumors that Soviet cosmonauts were lost have been circulating for years—long before Vladimir M. Komarov was killed last April, in the only fatal accident admitted by Moscow. For example, on Oct. 4, 1965, Electronic News reported "the Russians have lost 10 cosmonauts, including one woman, in faulty

space shots." This information was attributed to "a top NASA official."

In the same year, the celebrated "Penkovsky Papers" were published. Col. Oleg Penkovsky was a high official in Soviet intelligence. President Kennedy considered him to be our best informer inside the U.S.S.R. During the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, Mr. Kennedy relied on Col. Penkovsky's information about Soviet missile preparedness. Penkovsky was caught and executed.

The Penkovsky book contains two references to Soviet space fatalities. "Several sputniks were launched . . . and never heard from again. They took the lives of several trained astronauts." The colonel also asserted: "There were several unsuccessful launchings of sputniks, with men killed prior to Gagarin's flight. Either the missile would explode on the launching pad or it would go up and never return." Since Penkovsky's information on Soviet casualties proved to be accurate, there seems to be no reason to dispute his other disclosures. The Central Intelligence Agency allowed the publication of the Penkovsky materials.

In hearings before the foreign operations and government information subcommittee on May 23 and June 6, 1963, witnesses from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), hinted broadly that the Soviets had suffered various mishaps in space. But, on the ground that the information is classified, they shied away from full disclosure.

Some Soviet mishaps even became known to the free world through Communist sources. A few years ago, a high official of a Czech-Soviet space research center in Prague leaked to an Italian news agency the story that several Soviet cosmonauts had died in space.

Even more authentic was the front-page story in the London Daily Worker on April 12, 1961. The headlines read: "Soviet Cosmonaut Circles Earth Three Times" . . . "First Man in Space Back Alive—But Suffering from Effects of His Flight."

The story, according to which the Soviet cosmonaut was launched on April 7, 1961, was wired to the Daily Worker by its Moscow correspondent, Dennis Ogden.

He and other Communist correspondents had received sealed envelopes which contained the sensational story. The envelopes were not supposed to be opened without the permission of the Soviet government. All the Communist newsmen except Ogden followed the order.

Since the launching actually was a failure, the Kremlin never released the story—and only Ogden sent a dispatch anyway.

According to reliable information, the CIA submitted a confidential document to the White House early this year reporting the deaths of at least 11 cosmonauts in addition to that of Komarov.

The Washington decision not to disclose information on Soviet manned space flight failures was made during the last days of the Eisenhower Administration, presumably to protect intelligence sources. This decision is laid down in an agreement between the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated January 13, 1961.

At present, Washington's silence appears to be motivated by the strong desire to hear no evil, see no evil and speak no evil about the U.S.S.R.

According to the 1961 agreement, NASA publishes information on Soviet space activities which has "been authorized for public release through the office of the assistant secretary of defense for public affairs," provided "the data on foreign space activities" have been "officially reported to the United Nations Registry." In addition, only those data can be released which were confirmed by the U.S. space surveillance system run by the North American Air Defense Command.

However, only those confirmed "data on foreign space activities (including failures)" can be released by NASA "which have been publicly announced by the foreign government concerned."

With the one exception of the Komarov catastrophe, which could not be concealed, the Soviets have never yet announced any of their manned space flight failures. Hence, the agreement of Jan. 13, 1961, has probably resulted in the withholding of such information from the American public.

The DoD-NASA agreement has been the object of much Congressional criticism. But it still remains in force.

The U.S. informational policy on our own space activities is entirely open and frank. But since there is no corollary policy of openness with regard to Soviet space activities, the "image" of American space accomplishments is being harmed.

On July 4, 1967, the Moss Act became the law of the land. Rep. John E. Moss of California has been fighting for 10 long years against unnecessary government secrecy. The Moss Act stipulates that unless disclosure would endanger national security, government information should be made available to the American people.

The act amplifies Executive Order 10501, issued by President Eisenhower on Nov. 5, 1953, in that it authorizes court action to force release of such information.

It is hard to see how information about Soviet space failures could hurt the United States. Nor is there any emergency which, to deceive a political opponent, would justify news management. The U.S. government has been reporting on Soviet nuclear tests without ever asking Moscow's permission. Since the first Soviet nuclear explosion in 1949, American security, which ultimately is dependent upon an informed public, has been predicated on the release policy originated by President Truman.

The DoD-NASA agreement results in deceiving the American public and is, therefore, incompatible with the spirit and letter of the Moss Act. It is high time that Washington give an honest accounting of Soviet space losses.

Political Letter From the Northern Virginia Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a resident of my congressional district asks that I call the attention of Congress to the fact that there was a group of demonstrating students present at the Pentagon's north parking lot on Saturday, October 21, supporting the position of the United States in Southeast Asia. These students from local universities, I am told, were labeled Nazis by a story appearing in the Washington press, and were accorded no further publicity. If indeed this is an accurate account, and I have no reason to suspect that it is not, then the press has reason to apologize to this group, both for applying an offensive and incorrect label to them and for not according their efforts proportional coverage.

Inasmuch as this was not done, I insert for your consideration the "Political Letter From the Northern Virginia Commit-

PENKOVSKY, COL.

Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000600240006-7

tee" in the RECORD without further comment:

POLITICAL LETTER FROM THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 24, 1967.

THEY WERE GIVEN A MONOPOLY—WHY?

Saturday, 21 October 1967, should go down as Bastille Day for the Communist Revolution in the United States. Let us now work to prevent a Reign of Terror.

The Communist Party is now surfacing in the United States. Their demonstration at the Pentagon was a success. They achieved their prime objective. They broke into the Pentagon on Saturday and went back home on Sunday, leaving the GSA janitors to clean up the mess at public expense.

At about 5:30 p.m. on Saturday afternoon, 21 October 1967, an infamous act occurred when a Communist-led mob was pushed out of the Pentagon by young American soldiers crowding through a narrow passage way. The Historic Photo of 1967 was made for the front pages of Hanoi and Peking and Moscow. (See front page of Washington Star of October 22, and 10,000 other front pages in the world, for that day.)

The Vietnam War is probably extended by many months and thousands of American lives.

How can such an infamous event occur?

It happened because the Communist leaders had the Pentagon demonstration area all to themselves. The Communist leaders of the mob, during the days before the event, announced boldly and clearly they would break into the building. (After all, this was the purpose of the whole affair.)

But, in spite of their announced felonious intent, they were provided the jumping off place for the Pentagon door!

No other applicant was given a permit. Those who applied to demonstrate against the Communist-led group were turned down by the janitor of the Federal Government, the General Services Administration.

A valiant group of anti-Communist youth from Georgetown and George Washington Universities, with the famous Pastor Richard Wurmbrand, a prisoner of the Communists in Rumania for eleven years, managed to break into North Parking, which was approved Communist territory, just as the mob was entering from Lincoln Memorial at about 2:45 p.m., Saturday.

The anti-Communist group, very effectively led, began, by means of their speeches and posters to break up the Communist-led meeting at the North Parking entrance from the Memorial side! The Communist-led group dispersed to the other end of the lot at 4 PM, and prepared for the break-through into the Mall entrance of the Pentagon at 5:30 PM.

But the heart-breaking thing was the report of this event in the Washington Sunday Star, on 22 October 1967. The anti-Communist demonstrators, who were supporting the soldiers in the Pentagon, and, the war in Vietnam were labeled as "Nazis". It appears in the news summary of the entire day in the Washington Star of Sunday, 22 October, page 9, column 5.

It is possible that the U.S. Army itself is endangered by the agents of the Communist Party of the U.S. And, it is puzzling to the law-abiding citizen of the great suburbs of Washington why the Communist leaders were given the monopoly of the Pentagon North Parking lot on 21 October 1967. And, the law-abiding suburbanite deserves a true story of what happened in the North Parking lot, as the Communist-led mob entered.

After all, while the Communist-led mob was attacking the headquarters for the defense of freedom in this world, Mr. Suburbanite was back home putting fertilizer on his front lawn on the beautiful Indian Summer day.

Mr. Suburbanite was the little man who wasn't there. That's why they were given a monopoly.

EDWARD J. SLOANE,
Northern Virginia Committee.

Awash in Bureaucratic Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Cincinnati Enquirer has commented editorially on a legislative battle that is currently underway in Congress. Along with several other Representatives and Senators, I have introduced legislation that would enable Green Line Steamers, Inc., to proceed with construction of a new \$4 million passenger riverboat.

For the information of my colleagues, I include the following editorial:

AWASH IN BUREAUCRATIC SEAS

Even on clear days we often find it difficult to fathom some of the workings of the bureaucratic mind. But even though the weather in these parts was exceptionally fair the last time we looked we must confess to complete bewilderment at the most recent example of Federal flea-mindedness to come to our attention.

The case in point:

Finding itself compelled, because of new Federal safety laws enacted in the wake of the Yarmouth Castle disaster, to build a new boat to replace that venerable but still popular river siren, the Delta Queen, the Greene Line took what its officials thought was a quite proper step.

On the theory that if inland vessels were to be placed under the same safety regulations as ocean-going ships they should come under the same Federal mortgage insurance provisions, the line sought the larger amount applicable for ocean vessels—87.5% as against 75%.

Reps. Robert Taft Jr. and Donald D. Clancy, among others, introduced bills to this effect. In all, seven bills have been introduced in the House, and one, cosponsored by Sen. Jennings Randolph (D., W. Va.) and Sen. Stephen M. Young (D., Ohio), in the Senate.

The Greene Line plea received the sympathetic ear of Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett (D., Alaska), whose subcommittee is considering the Senate bill. Senator Bartlett, advised by company officials that a \$500,000 down payment for the replacement could be met but that the \$1 million needed if the loan were guaranteed at only 75% would be impossible to raise, said he thought it would be a "tragedy" if the sole surviving overnight passenger riverboat in this country were to disappear without a replacement. If the Delta Queen's replacement is not ready for service by November 1, 1968, that is exactly what will happen, because of the new Federal regulations.

Senator Bartlett took a dim view of administration objections, as expressed by the Maritime Administration of the U.S. Commerce Department and the Bureau of the Budget. We are in accord with the senator.

Although the general counsel of the Maritime Division testified that this office "was not aware that any general needs exists" for the legislation, we beg to differ.

The mere fact that the Delta Queen has

been operating at a phenomenal 95% of capacity should be eloquent testimony to the fact that the vessel serves "a need."

The Delta Queen, although it is a reminder of past days of teeming river traffic and the joys of leisurely, comfortable transportation, is no museum piece. It is an operational piece of transport that provides a desired service as witnessed by its popularity. And so too will be its replacement, the new Queen.

There is no question here concerning an outlay of public funds for private enterprise. All that is being asked is a mortgage guarantee, similar to those effected for construction of deep-water vessels, so that the line may make arrangements to contract for a new vessel.

One of the most inexplicable facets of the executive branch's opposition to the proposed legislation was revealed when its counsel, Mr. Davis, testified that he personally favored the proposal, although he was there to express official opposition.

So far, the measures to save the surviving page of one of this nation's most colorful chapters have fallen on sympathetic congressional ears. We hope this feeling can be generate to an extent that it will nullify administration objections that have appeared banal, confused and flimsy.

Shipbuilding Industry and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a speech recently made by Edwin Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, on the subject of the shipbuilding industry as the fourth arm of defense.

Mr. Hood effectively spells out the importance of a strong merchant marine and shipbuilding industry to our national defense.

This is a point which cannot be made often enough, and I recommend Mr. Hood's cogent statement to my colleagues:

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Speech by Edwin M. Hood, president, shipbuilders Council of America, before Naval Reserve National Engineering Unit 5-2, Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967)

It is often asserted that the U.S. shipbuilding industry is an essential component of the Fourth Arm of Defense, and I therefore welcome this opportunity to discuss with you the relationship of our commercial shipyards to the national defense.

Let me begin by pointing out certain facts concerning the nature and size of our shipbuilding industry.

Shipbuilding, as many of you may know, is primarily an assembly process. The shipbuilders' true manufacturing process consists of forming and tying together the hull structure from steel plates and shapes. His principal capital investment is therefore in the heavy metalworking and materials handling equipment required for this manufacturing activity, in providing the means for assembling this product of manufacture into the integrated structure, and in getting the structure waterborne.